

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Formalities

The specification has been revised to correct a few minor grammatical and idiomatic errors. Because the changes are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that the changes do not involve new matter.

2. Objection to Drawings Under 37 CFR 1.83(a)

This objection, for failure to show the microprocessor mounted in a control circuit as recited in **claim 2**, has been addressed by canceling claim 2.

3. Rejection of Claims 1, 6, and 8-9 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of “*Making Email Talk With MIME*” (UIC Reference)

This rejection has been rendered moot by the amendment of claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 7.

4. Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 7 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of the UIC Reference

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the UIC Reference neither discloses nor suggests:

- (i) finding and directly activating electronic processor software after a **simple keyword search** of the message, **as opposed to** determining a data type upon **opening the message and processing the header**, and only then activating software related to the data type; and
- (ii) a **mobile phone** with the capability of finding and activating electronic processor software related to keyword.

As explained in the introductory portion of the present application, the present invention by-passes the step of opening an e-mail message in order to process the header and only thereafter activate the appropriate software. Instead of processing the message header, the claimed invention simply searches for a keyword in the header. There is no need to undergo the complete MIME processing procedure, which is important in the case of small electronic devices with limited memory, such as mobile phones.

The MIME processing procedure described in the UIC Reference is an encoding method permits multiple data types to be included in an e-mail. Since the different data types are encoded into a single message, MIME adds a few lines to the traditional e-mail message header that describe the MIME content of the message. The MIME header includes (a) a **version identifier** that declares the email to be a MIME message, (b) a **content type** that specifies the type of data contained in the body of the message, including a general data type (text, image, video, etc.) and a “subtype” giving a specific data format and/or character set other than 7-bit US ASCII to identify the different data types included in the message, and (c) a **content-transfer-encoding identifier** that specifies how the data has been encoded for transport. In conventional e-mail processing, all of the MIME header information must be processed in order to determine the data type and associate the appropriate processing program. The claimed invention provides a shortcut suitable for use in mobile phones.

The MIME header does not specify specific software for processing the data, much less a “keyword” that can be used to directly find and activate the software, as claimed, thereby permitting different types of electronic message to be immediately outputted by the appropriate software to an output device connected to the electronic device that receives the message, as claimed. Instead, MIME only specifies **version**, **content type**, and **encoding**, each of which must be analyzed upon opening of the e-mail message before processing software can be selected. None of the three identifiers corresponds to a “keyword” that finds and activates related software, as claimed.

It might be argued that “content type” specifies related software. However, content type is not in the form of a **keyword**, but rather a **file extension** (the examples given on page 9/12 of the UIC reference are “.gif” and “.html”) that must be extracted during the message opening procedure. The content type merely identifies general data **types** and at best enables association with a type of software, rather than actually invoking a specific software program based on a keyword. Numerous different programs can be used to process a general data type, and the file extension does not activate any specific program but rather enables a control program or “MIME agent” in the receiving device to determine which software to activate. As explained in the first complete sentence on page 12/12 of the UIC reference, in order to process a file with an .rtf extension, the user must “[C]onfigure your MIME user agent to open the RTF file in the word processor of your choice.” MIME only specifies that the file is an .rtf data type file—the .rtf data type specifies a variety of applications that could be used to process the file, and not a particular software as claimed. The “content type” extension described in the UIC reference does **not** function in the same manner as the claimed keyword, which enables software to be selected after a keyword search.

According to the claimed invention, when a message is received, the mobile phone simply searches for matches between a predetermined keyword and keywords contained in a message, and activates corresponding software if a keyword is found, thereby permitting the message to be processed by appropriate software and automatically output to an output device of the mobile phone. **There is no need to open the e-mail and parse the header, as described in the UIC reference, before selecting the software that reads the attachment.** Instead, in the claimed invention, it is the keyword search and not processing of a MIME header by a MIME agent that activates the specific software used to process the message. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed “keyword” is not the same as the “content type” extension or any other information contained in the MIME header described in the UIC reference, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial Number 09/737,477

Having thus overcome each of the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Urcia', followed by a long horizontal line.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: August 17, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\ba\Pending L..PLN\AI 737477\01.wpd